

E13341



MAHATMA GANDHI



MAHATMA GANDHI

GANDHI

The SAINT *as* STATESMAN

by

SYUD HOSSAIN

FORMERLY EDITOR, *The New Orient* (New York)

LECTURER IN *History and Civilization of India*

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

SUTTONHOUSE LTD.

LOS ANGELES

SAN FRANCISCO

NEW YORK

Copyright 1937
SUTTONHOUSE LTD.

FIRST EDITION

Printed in the United States of America
by Kellaway-Ide Company, Los Angeles

To
JULIA ELLSWORTH FORD
Admirer of Gandhi
Friend of India and the Orient
Life-long Champion of worthy Causes
this little book is inscribed
as a token of affection and admiration
by the Author.

A MESSAGE FROM
MAHATMA GANDHI
to the AUTHOR

Here is my
'There is no escape for man
or woman black or white
or for the East or the West except
through innocence (nonviolence
and truth.'
Yours sincerely
M. K. Gandhi

Here is my message. "There is no
escape for man or woman, black or
white, or for the East or the West ex-
cept through innocence (nonviolence)
and truth."

Yours sincerely,
M. K. GANDHI

PART ONE

MAHATMA GANDHI AS I KNOW HIM

I

JESUS brought to the world a simple story. Through a season of bitter persecution, He practiced nonviolence. He sacrificed himself without defense, and was crucified, but in so doing He conquered half the world.

Gandhi is doing much the same. His is a message of liberation in the most comprehensive sense of the term, also bed-rocked upon nonviolence and self-abnegation. There is nothing that Gandhi seeks for himself; on the contrary, he has shown himself dauntlessly willing to sacrifice himself for the truth that is in him.

In the course of the long crusade which is now nearing its climax, Gandhi has not only captured the hearts of his own people—numbering 300,000,000 and more—but also, it would seem, the imagination of the rest of the world. Even on the basis of his record so far, he must be ranked as among the half-dozen most significant and influential figures of this epoch. There are aspects in which his personality is unique in the contemporary world.

What manner of man is Gandhi? If one came upon him in a crowd or at a meeting, or in a railway compartment in India, one would probably not look

at him a second time (assuming, of course, that he were unattended and unheralded). But no one who has really looked into Gandhi's eyes can ever forget him. Those eyes are certainly the windows of his soul. This man, you would say, is carrying the sorrows and burdens of humanity. His is an anguished and consecrated life. Yet he has retained the gift of a spontaneous laughter, especially when he is with children, as well as a serene sense of humor.

In actual physical make-up, Gandhi is ethereal and ascetic — almost a walking skeleton, weighing less than 100 pounds. His height is medium, but his extreme fragility makes him look smaller than he is. His features, always excepting the eyes, are neither beautiful nor regular, but in their totality present a countenance at once rugged and tender, deeply seamed and sensitively mobile. A massive head, with close cropped, gray hair (since I saw him last it has become white), is supported on a comparatively frail neck, and is flanked by large ears. A long nose surmounts a crisply clipped mustache, fringing the upper lip of a mouth naturally large and unnecessarily somewhat toothless.

A rather conspicuous pair of glasses precariously attaches itself to his nose, but never really succeeds in dimming the glow or diverting the gaze of dark brown and small eyes, which more often than not may be averted in contemplation or through courtesy, but which may readily and swiftly attain an expression of cosmic steadfastness or devastating directness. To complete the picture — and the

paradox — a gentle, winsome, irresistible smile, astonishingly often, irradiates and redeems this physiognomic ensemble.

By fundamental temperament Gandhi is an ascetic, a puritan, and an absolutist. Although he has evolved to his present spiritual and intellectual state by sustained and unflinching self-discipline for more than 30 years, which included a ceaseless self-scrutiny for the motives behind his acts, his boyhood and early manhood were lived normally in conformity with the customs and usages of the caste and community in which he was born.

But the roots of his temperament undoubtedly go back to his racial and religious inheritance. Gandhi was born in an orthodox family owning allegiance to the Jain faith — perhaps the most rigorously puritanical branch or off-shoot of the Hindu religion. The cardinal principle of Jainism is reverence for life—all life—human and other, with the corollary of nonviolence and noninjury to any being in any shape or form. Furthermore, Jainism enjoins upon its followers complete and absolute abstention from all meat diet and all and every variety of alcoholic or intoxicating beverages, as well as a strict standard of sexual purity.

When in his later teens Gandhi finally overcame the objections of his parents to proceed to England to study for the bar, his mother only consented when he had made a solemn vow to her that during the years of his sojourn in England Gandhi would remain a celibate and scrupulously refrain from

eating meat or drinking liquor. It is characteristic of Gandhi that, as he records in his autobiography, he was able, in spite of "hellish temptations," as he puts it, to keep that vow.

During this period of trial in a foreign land, Gandhi records, whenever he was tempted and seemed to weaken in his resolve, he always steadied himself by the thought of his mother. "How could I look her in the face when I go back?" was the question he asked himself, and that seemed to settle all his doubts and hesitations. This episode was an early indication of his inherent capacity for a Spartan self-discipline.

The routine of Gandhi's daily life is unique; it reveals both his personality and his principles. He rises at 4 a.m. and invariably the first item of the day's schedule is an hour's prayer and meditation.

Then follows an average of twelve hours of sustained and methodical work—seeing visitors, attending to correspondence, writing or dictating articles, taking part in conferences on matters of national interest or importance, responding to the thousand and one calls upon him from all parts of the country as the generalissimo of the National movement.

The Mahatma¹ does not take or get a respite of

¹The term Mahatma in the Indian language means, literally, "Great Soul." It is an appellation of veneration that the Indian people of all types and kinds and religious persuasions have voluntarily applied to Gandhi for the better part of twenty years. That is the measure of their reverence and affection for him. Gandhi has more than once in recent years publicly protested against having holiness thus thrust upon him, but in vain. It looks now as though he will irrevocably go down in history as the Mahatma.

even half an hour during this period of rigorously scheduled activity. Even when he partakes of his frugal mid-day meal, consisting invariably of milk and fruit, he does not seek privacy. On the contrary, he looks upon the occasion apparently as a half-hour of social relaxation, for it is not uncommon for a dozen or more casual visitors, who possibly have been waiting anywhere from one to six hours to see him, to be shown in. The Mahatma converses with them cordially and pleasantly while he takes his meal. (This type of visitor usually comes without appointment, hailing from all parts of India, and the purpose of their pilgrimage is more to pay their personal homage to Gandhi than to discuss any particular matter or problem with him).

The day ends for the Mahatma as it begins — with an hour of prayer and meditation. This often includes singing of sacred and devotional songs by the members of his little community house. When he finally turns in, it is to sleep on a piece of meager bedding spread on the bare floor. Mahatma Gandhi's sleep averages from four to five hours; another four hours may be said to take up his prayers and meditations, ablutions and meals; for four hours again religiously every day he spins the coarse "Kadda" (homespun cloth). Almost every quarter of an hour of the remaining twelve hours is accounted for by a program of work and activity systematically arranged and regulated.

Such are the daily life and working habits of the

man for whom it has been claimed by responsible critics that he is literally the most widely influential individual of our age. An informed English observer, S. K. Ratcliffe, says that Gandhi is "the most extraordinary popular leader ever known. His followers are counted by tens of millions."

II

What is the background of Gandhi's remarkable career, and what are the incidents and developments that have given him his amazing philosophy of life?

I referred at the outset to the racial and religious inheritance of Gandhi. That constitutes a bedrock foundation for the upbuilding of his character and personality which must never be lost sight of. I myself subscribe to the view that only India could ever have produced Gandhi, not in any stupid sense of national egotism or racial exclusiveness, but as the expression or reincarnation of an immemorial racial genius. Gandhi is not an isolated or unrelated phenomenon. He is the latest manifestation and embodiment of that spiritual principle or impulse that gave to mankind its earliest recorded or extant scriptures, that marks the first formulation in human annals, (antedating both Judaism and Zoroastrianism, as well as the Greeks,) of the concepts of spiritual religion and systematic philosophy.

Gandhi comes in the line of true succession to Buddha and to Mahavira, the founder of Jainism,

and contemporary of Buddha—but less well known to the Western World—and to a host of other prophets and teachers and seers produced by India in the last 2,500 years, who have held, with whatever variations of emphasis or detail, the same ultimate and absolute principles of human conduct as the prelude and determinant of individual human destiny.

It is important, however, to realize that Gandhi is not exclusively the product of his race or clime. In his ideals he represents the spiritual traditions of the age-long past, but in his technique he is the personification of a fierce modernity. His philosophy of life is not solely derived from Hinduism or from Buddhism, from Jainism or the Vedanta. Gandhi represents a rare synthesis of the ancient and the modern, of the East and the West. In his first year in England Gandhi read eighty books on Christianity. The only one of them that made an enduring appeal to his spiritual consciousness was the New Testament. He says of the Sermon on the Mount that it "went straight to my heart on the first reading." Plato and Ruskin had interested him sufficiently to make him embark on partial translations of them into his native language. Thoreau and Mazzini made even more lasting and penetrating dents upon his consciousness. Meanwhile, old Tolstoy had discovered young Gandhi, and corresponded with him.

A very important and significant influence on Gandhi which is indispensable to a proper under-

standing of his present role of the arbiter of India's destinies was that of Islam. Gandhi first consciously came in contact with Mohammedans in South Africa. Many of his hosts and friends, associates and comrades, followers and disciples in the twenty years that he spent in South Africa—where he laid the foundations of his public career and tested, as in fire, his political principles in a memorable career of strenuous leadership—which was the prelude to his appearance upon the Indian scene and stage—were Mohammedans.

He studied the Koran and the life of the Prophet and the history of the early leaders who were the teachers and exemplars of the new faith. The character of the Caliph Ali, Gandhi once told me, he greatly admired. Gandhi always has liked the Mohammedans. C. F. Andrews, his friend and biographer, says that Gandhi always has reacted sympathetically to the virility and directness that characterize the Mohammedans. Mohammedans, on their part, seem to like him. It is certainly true that Gandhi today has a larger Mohammedan following in India than any individual Mohammedan leader.

Gandhi holds that all religions are true, sacred to their respective followers, and entitled to the reverence of all. For himself, in spite of his wide and deep studies in comparative religion, he remains a follower of Hinduism. He said:

My faith offers me all that is necessary for my inner development, for it teaches me to pray. But I also pray

that everyone else may develop to the fullness of his being in his own religion— that the Christian may become a better Christian and the Mohammedan a better Mohammedan. I am convinced that God will one day ask us only what we are and what we do, not the name we give to our being and doing.

There is a story that Stanley Jones, the veteran American missionary in India, once consulted Gandhi as to the best method by which the Christian missions might be made more influential and effective in their ministry among the Indian people. Gandhi suggested that the Christian missionaries might usefully begin patterning their lives upon that of their Master.

Any formal allegiance apart, the basic spiritual principles of Gandhi's life are two: the constant seeking and unflinching service of truth as one may see it and know it; the positive application of love to all of one's fellow beings at all times, with the corollary of nonviolence in thought, word or deed, even when confronted with the gravest provocation or persecution.

The following passage from *Gandhi versus The Empire* by H. Muzumdar is apropos and of interest:—

In Geneva, the birthplace of Calvinism, the Mahatma discussed Truth and God in startlingly refreshing terms. "Up till now," said Gandhi, "I used to say 'God is Truth'. Now I believe Truth is God." The statement "God is Truth" is partial, contends Gandhi; the statement "Truth is God" is all-inclusive. The atheist in quest of Truth by way of skepticism, the scientist in quest of Truth by way of empiricism, the philosopher in quest of Truth by way of a search for the Prime Cause, the logician in quest of Truth by way of dialectic—

tics, the literateur in quest of Truth by way of rhetorics, the devotee in quest of Truth by way of ecstatic devotion, the philanthropist in quest of Truth by way of munificence, the social worker in quest of Truth by way of social service, the craftsman in quest of Truth by way of craftsmanship — all these and many another, each in his own way, would be serving according to Gandhi's definition which says that *Truth is God*.

Truth is unrealizable except in terms of *Ahimsa*, that is to say, except in terms of non-violence and love. *Ahimsa* is to be viewed not merely as a grand principle, but as *the way of life*. To complete Gandhi's chain of reasoning we must recall the ancient Sanskrit saying: *Satyameva Jayate*, i. e., TRUTH ALONE CONQUERS!

More than a quarter of a century ago in South Africa when he was carrying on some very delicate and difficult negotiations with the local government for the redress of wrongs and hardships to his people there, a fervid and devoted young follower of his suddenly made a ferocious attack upon him and nearly killed him, under the misapprehension that Gandhi was going to sell out to the enemy. Gandhi was taken to a hospital, and the government agents arrested the assailant. But to the intense disgust of officialdom, when Gandhi recovered consciousness and was asked as a formality to enter a charge against his assailant, he declined. He said he knew the young man very well, and if he had acted as he had, it was from an excess of zeal and devotion to the cause! "The man will yet be my friend," Gandhi said. The young man's repentance—he was a fiery, war-like person—took the form, so it is said, of his constituting himself Gandhi's personal bodyguard thereafter!

That was when Gandhi was winning his spurs as a young patriot and passive resister. In April, 1931, in India at Karachi, the full-fledged Mahatma was confronted by a group of young "Redshirts," Indian Communists, whose truculence and violence was equalled only by their Utopian idealism. They not only charged him with having "betrayed India" by his "pact" with Lord Irwin, the British Viceroy, but there was even an attempted assault on Gandhi by some of the more fanatically zealous of these self-constituted saviors of their country.

Gently, but firmly, Gandhi took them in hand.

You say I have betrayed India. I shall not complain if you beat me. I have no bodyguard. God alone keeps vigil over me. Some men think me crazy and a fool because of my love for my enemies, but that is the very foundation of my whole life's work and creed.***I have no weapon against you except love.

His accusers and assailants melted away in tears and audible sobs. (At least on three occasions during his career Gandhi has been the victim of mob assaults resulting in almost fatal injuries, but never once did he seek to have any form of revenge upon or punishment of his persecutors.)

III

Nonviolence is thus both a principle and an instrument of Gandhi's technique, but if any Westerner held that nonviolence, in Gandhi's sense and use of the term, was anything pusillanimous he would make a grievous blunder. There is nothing namby-pamby about Gandhi. He is a spiritual

athlete. His is no creed of cowardice. Gandhi has little use for one who is pacific only because panicky.

"Where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence," he has said. What he holds true of individuals he applies firmly to the nation:

I would risk violence a thousand times rather than emasculation of the race. I would rather have India resort to arms to defend her honor than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless victim to her own dishonor, but I believe that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence.

In the spiritual synthesis which Gandhi has personally achieved, the guiding principle, as I have indicated, is service of Truth by nonviolence and self-sacrifice. Analyzed, this means that Gandhi believes that there is and should be only one governing law operative in all the affairs and relationships of humanity—individual, domestic, national, international and any other. And that is the law of *Love*. By the same token he rules out hate in any shape or form from the scheme of human relationship—in the interest not so much of the potential objects of one's hatred as in that of the sanctity and integrity of one's own immortal soul! By ruling out hate from his scheme of things Gandhi automatically rejects and repudiates violence or coercion which he regards as merely the instruments which subserve hate. To him the attainment of any end, however intrinsically laudable it may be in itself, by methods of forcible compulsion, is a gross immorality. For Gandhi emphatically the

end does not justify the means. But in condemning the conventional methods, Gandhi is very far from following the line of least resistance. If from his point of view the implement of force is sinful, even in retaliation to injury, so also even more are the oppression and exploitation of the poor and the humble. And Gandhi holds it to be the bounden duty of every individual not to acquiesce in or compromise with Evil, but on the contrary, positively to give it battle. But the difference is that Gandhi gives battle to wrong not by retaliatory hate and violence but by love and self-suffering. In other words, it is the practical unvarying application in daily life and to mundane affairs of the spirit embodied in "Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do." The application, however, is at once restrospective and redemptive.

Perhaps the most distinctive contribution of Gandhi to the ethical idealism of his time is his application of these principles on a scale that is unprecedented, and in a domain where it has never been tried before, namely, the notoriously sanguinary field in which Imperialism and Nationalism deadlock for mutual destruction.

We may now perhaps better realize how the saint came to be also the recognized and undisputed leader of perhaps the greatest national revolutionary movement of history.

It was after long years of careful study and observation, and after disillusionment had followed upon disillusionment, (climaxing in the incredibly

cynical and gruesome episode of the massacre of Amritsar in the spring of 1919), that Gandhi finally and reluctantly came to the conclusion that British rule in India was, in his own words, "satanic"—that it had operated in its totality to the grave detriment of the Indian people. It had, he held, spiritually emasculated them by sustained denial and filching away of their natural and national rights; and by prolonged economic exploitation, it had materially impoverished them to the point of destitution. When Gandhi had become finally convinced of this in his own mind and had despaired of the British Government ever relaxing their strangle-hold upon India of their own accord or volition, he served notice upon them that if the situation could not be mended then it must be ended.

That was the beginning of the now famous "non-violent non-cooperation movement" in India eighteen years ago. This unwieldy phrase had to be especially invented to give expression to the peculiar technique of the revolution launched by Mahatma Gandhi. In effect, he announced that inasmuch as British rule in India rested upon a foundation of coercive force, military and naval, and was motivated primarily by greed and self-interest, it was immoral; and that therefore it was sinful for Indians in any shape or form to cooperate with it and thereby help its perpetuation. On the contrary, Mahatma Gandhi held that it was their duty to "non-cooperate" with the British Government in all its ways and works, and even to embark upon

the civil disobedience of all laws passed by the British Government which were repugnant to the moral sense of the people or infringed their inalienable natural rights.

This movement of nation-wide non-cooperation, however, was to be conducted at every stage and at all times in a spirit and by methods of complete and unconditional non-violence. Upon his followers he enjoined non-violence not only in action but even in thought and in spirit. They must resist the British but not hate them. Even if and when confronted with repression and terrorism by the agents of government they might never retaliate with violence but unflinchingly suffer. They were to conquer by love. They might die but never kill.

On one occasion of memorable tension, when he was being accused by some of his more radical followers of showing undue forbearance to the British, he said:

There is only one God for us all, whether we find Him through the Bible, the Koran, the Gita, the Zend-Avesta, or the Talmud, and he is the God of love and truth. I do not hate an Englishman. I have spoken much against his institutions, especially the one he has set up in India. But you must not mistake my condemnation of the system for that of the man. My religion requires me to love him as I love myself. I have no interest in living except to prove the faith in me. I would deny God if I do not attempt to prove it at this critical moment.

IV

In 1922 the British Government in India arrested Mahatma Gandhi and placed him on trial for "sedi-

tion." It was a trial that ranks in significance with, and is reminiscent in details and drama of, the historic trials of Socrates, Jesus and Savonarola.

When Gandhi the accused was brought into the crowded court, escorted by two policemen, a curious and unexpected thing happened. Everybody in the court, the members of the public and the bar, the minor functionaries of the court, the prosecuting counsel, and last but not least, the august and panoplied British judge himself, as though propelled by an unseen force, simultaneously rose to their feet in silent homage to the prisoner in the dock. (It was a memorable demonstration of the power of that "soul force" which Gandhi claims is more potent than any other force.)

Gandhi had engaged no counsel for defense and had offered no alibi or extenuation for his alleged offense. Technically he was charged with promoting "disaffection" toward the government. Instead of pleading "not guilty" he pleaded "guilty." He said that as he could not possibly have feelings of affection for a government whose practices and activities towards the people he felt and believed had been "satanic," the only alternative for him was to preach and promote disaffection toward it. He could not and would not compromise with evil. While he did not shirk his duty, on the other hand, he would not evade his responsibility. He said:

I am here, therefore, to invite and cheerfully submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in the law is a deliberate crime and what appears

to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course left open to you, judge, is either to resign your position or to inflict on me the severest penalty.

It was really the judge, a symbol of British rule, who was on trial. It must be said, however, that he acquitted himself, having regard to all the circumstances, political and psychological, with a sensitive and courtly decency which does honor to the British bench. The judge had to do his professional duty, but it obviously hurt him much more than it did the accused, to sentence him to six years' imprisonment. He was apologetic and unhappy. Here are the opening words from the decision of Judge C. N. Broomfield:

Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy in one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains, namely, the determination of a just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face. The law is no respecter of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that, in the eyes of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and of even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticize you in any other character.

The historic comment on the episode was provided by the Lord Bishop of Madras, himself an Englishman and one of the leading ecclesiastical functionaries in India. He said:

I frankly confess, although it deeply grieves me to

say it, that I see in Mr. Gandhi the patient sufferer for the cause of righteousness and mercy, a truer representative of the Crucified Saviour than the men who have thrown him into prison and yet call themselves by the name of Christ.

We may conclude with the answer to the question that is often inevitably asked: What is the secret of his phenomenal influence on the millions of his fellow countrymen? There is certainly no living leader in the contemporary world whose personal following comes anywhere near Gandhi's in numbers, or whose hold on the devotion of his followers is as firm and sustained as that of Gandhi. Moreover, it must be noted that he commands allegiance by the sheer force of his personality, and without resort to any sort or kind of coercion or compulsion. He holds no office and is the permanent head of no organization. The devotion he inspires is wholly voluntary. Here, with a vengeance, is a prophet who is honored in his own country.

Any attempt to account for this phenomenon must of course take into account at the very outset the stark integrity of the man. Here is a life that has been lived for 30 years and more in the full glare of publicity, and upon which has also constantly beaten the fierce light of hostile political controversy. The figure revealed under this X-ray is one of elemental simplicity. His integrity is equalled by his selflessness.

So far from wanting anything for himself from the world, Gandhi has deliberately in a sense renounced the world and its so-called rewards and

emoluments. He had become a wealthy man at an early age, with an income of more than \$20,000 a year. He gave away his wealth for various philanthropies and took the vow of poverty and non-possession of material things. This was in order better to achieve his spiritual self-realization, as well as to be better able to lead the crusade of political and social deliverance for his people which he had planned.

Gandhi lives a consecrated life. He has not only spiritually identified himself with the sorrows and sufferings of his people, but in the comforts and conveniences of material life, he will take no more for himself than the poorest and humblest of his fellow countrymen. That is why he wears the famous loin cloth.¹ It is the symbol of the destitution and disinheritance of millions of his compatriots who actually cannot afford any more. (The per capita income of India today is less than 8 cents a day.)

No wonder the people respond to a leader like that. His simplicity really represents a consecrated religious fervor—an intense, self-consuming dedication to the well-being of others.

Here is a glimpse of Gandhi as seen and recorded by a distinguished American, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, when he visited him on a recent occasion of the annual meeting of the Indian National Congress:

I went to say goodbye to Gandhi. He was in his private tent, and we walked to the large tent together. But

¹See Appendix A.

the multitude thronged upon him. I saw men's faces lit with a love I have never seen for any human being. I saw mothers hold up their children to see him. I saw educated men close their eyes in prayer, or touch his garment or kiss his foot. I saw him moving as calm and untroubled as Buddha. On that old face I saw a light that never shone on sea or land. I had seen a man who lived in God.

If Gandhi has done nothing else he has provided our age, with all its materialism and self-sufficiency, its cynicism and disillusionment, with one more witness to the spiritual values of life cast in the heroic and classic mould of the prophets, the martyrs, and the saviours of mankind.

PART II

Apostles of World Reconstruction

I

A Professor at Columbia University said not long ago that a hundred years hence when the historian of the future comes to deal with our times he would primarily concern himself with three figures—Woodrow Wilson, Lenin, and Gandhi.

This was an *obiter dictum*, and he did not pause to develop the theme. The notion is suggestive enough, however, to deserve elaboration.

It may be argued that these are the three outstanding apostles of world reconstruction that emerged from the gigantic cataclysm of the War and who, among them, have ever since dominated not merely much of the fundamental thinking of the world, but have also inspired the practical efforts, however tentative or abortive, toward organizing a new world order politically, economically and spiritually.

That there is a great deal of force in this tentative claim will scarcely be denied by well-informed and thoughtful people. The implication, of course, is that compared with these towering personalities the Lloyd Georges, the Poincaires, the Mussolinis, the Hitlers, and all the rest of the professional statesmen and politicians are as mushroom phe-

nomena—at once transitory and parochial—deriving a certain temporary importance from the offices they hold, or might have held, but having very little of that dynamic influence or enduring significance which alone is of consequence to the historian.

It seems worth while, then, to examine in terms of comparison and contrast the principles on which each of these three titans, respectively, based his scheme or philosophy of world reconstruction. Before we go into the divergences and even clashes among their principles it may be as well to emphasize an important element common to them all, namely, that each was essentially trying to visualize the world as a unit and attempting to lay the foundation for a new social order in the most comprehensive sense of the term. None of these men ultimately sought to plan for the benefit of any one nation or country but rather for the world as a whole. Their principles obviously have a world-wide range and implication.

Another characteristic common to all three men has been their capacity to excite opposite extremes of emotion. While on the one hand they have evoked the passionate devotion of millions of human beings, they have, on the other, equally aroused the fanatical antagonism and derision of others. This, however, is an experience which, significantly enough, they share with all those great figures of history who in different epochs have changed the map of the world, as well as the destiny of human beings.

II

Woodrow Wilson dreamed a great dream-- that of the League of Nations--and it is no detraction from the greatness of that vision if its actual materialization should have assumed so inadequate, not to say so sordid and impotent a form. His vision was an authentic one,--notwithstanding that, as many believe, the principles of Wilson were perverted and the true edifice of the League of Nations sabotaged at Versailles. Although the Wilsonian ideals have continued to be honored more in violation than in application, nevertheless, it is still difficult to see how the nations of the world can eventually escape the inexorable logic of some association or organization which would function as an effective and bonafide League of Nations.

Not merely the elimination of war, which is the crucial problem of civilization, but the ushering in of a new economic and social order resting upon durable international concord, are seemingly impossible of attainment without the instrumentality of a "League of Nations" with precisely those attributes which Wilson had originally outlined. This is one of the major experiments for the social advancement of humanity with which the twentieth century will continue to be pre-occupied.

The "international anarchy," in Lowes Dickinson's phrase, which has made of Europe an armed camp and threatens to keep it so in perpetuity, and which has made of the world at large an economic arena of unending cut-throat competition,

can only be resolved if the nations of the world — particularly the so-called “Great Powers”—agree to moderate the claims of their mutually exclusive sovereignties as a preliminary to pooling their respective authorities into a joint sanction for better international behavior. That would be the evolutionary method of salvation,—building upon but maintaining intact the *status quo* of the Capitalistic world. And that was Wilson’s hope and aim.

III

In the same field of world reconstruction is a formidable rival to Woodrow Wilson—Lenin. The Russian experiment, of course, involves a flat and complete rejection of all Wilson’s implied premises and repudiation of the postulates of the so-called Western civilization. This is one reason why so much bitterness, almost pathological in character, has been aroused by the Russian challenge. The dust of controversy, however, should not blind us to the intrinsic character of the Russian proposals, and before they are rejected in principle they should first be rationally and intelligently apprehended.

At the outset it may be well to make a note of one point. Those who think the Russian experiment, in its millennial aspect, is going to succeed and those others who feel that it is foredoomed to failure, are equally indulging in “wishful thinking.” No human being at this stage of the experiment can forecast either its success or its failure. At least

one clear generation must have elapsed from the post-revolutionary period before we can even begin to measure the gains and losses resulting from it, and its potential trends and chances of survival.

Meanwhile we can and should try to understand theoretically the fundamental principles of the Russian position. The first thing to note is that the Communistic experiment as it has materialized in Soviet Russia is literally an unprecedented event in human history. It involves a repudiation *in toto* of all the assumptions and traditions upon which the conventional civilizations of history have so far been based. Up to now, for instance, economics and ethics have been sciences rather apart both in theory and practice. The Russians seek to abolish the distinction and synthesize the two in an organically unified procedure. Every civilization we have had so far, and for that matter every traditional religion without exception, has taken it for granted that, in the scriptural phrase, the poor are always with us. The Russians say the poor shall not be with us, and that they should not be with us. And if the poor go, of course the rich go with them—there's the rub! The Russians seek, by their ideology, to create a society in which there shall be no room either for the poor or for the rich, but in which every man, woman, and child shall be assured, as a birthright, of food, shelter, protection, and care on the basis of co-operative work for the community; the necessities of life for all and excessive luxuries for none. We may look upon this

project as wholly Utopian, but it is no use to deny that up to date it is a serious and practical attempt to make the world over. A powerful and organized state representing one hundred and sixty millions of people is apparantly committed, with fanatical zeal, to the achieving of this self-same Utopia—which is something new under the sun.

The Soviet Constitution thus sets forth their aims:

The abolition of exploitation of men by men, the entire abolition of the division of the people into classes, the suppression of exploiters, the establishment of a socialist society and the victory of socialism in all lands.

The implications of the Russian position, it is obvious, challenge the very fundamentals of the existing world order. No wonder they have had to "abolish God"; they could not possibly have carried on under the aegis of the ancient and accepted Deity of humanity. No wonder they have had to scrap religion, not only their own orthodox church which was merely an annex of the Czardom, but all religion in the conventional sense, because such religion necessarily perpetuated the very distinction, economic and social, that the Russians are out to eradicate.

"Religion is the opium of the people," said Marx, and Lenin elaborated the text thus:

"Marxism regards all religions and churches, all religious organizations, as organs of bourgeois reaction, serving to drug the minds of the working class and to perpetuate their exploitation."

A curious corroborative light is thrown on Lenin's statement by an utterance of a not less renowned predecessor of his—Napoleon. An avowed skeptic, the Emperor had nevertheless been diligent in his patronage and support of a religion in which he admittedly did not believe. When taxed with his contradictory conduct Napoleon answered:

What is it that makes the poor man think it quite natural that there are fires in my palace while he is dying of cold? That I have ten coats in my wardrobe while he goes naked? That at each of my meals enough is served to feed his family for a week? It is simply religion, which tells him that in another life I shall be only his equal, and that he actually has more chance of being happy there than I. Yes, we must see to it that the floors of the churches are open to all, and that it does not cost the poor man much to have prayers said on his tomb.

No student of Russian history can doubt that a great deal of the official religion in Russia under the Czars subserved precisely the ends and aims set forth in Napoleon's cogitation. It is this circumstance that explains the violence of the reaction to religion and church that the Revolution itself and the post-Revolutionary regime have demonstrated.

With Vladimir of Kiev in 988 A.D. begins the Christian tradition of Russia, and the national adoption, progressively, of Greek Orthodoxy. Strictly speaking, however, it was not Vladimir but Peter the Great (coming some seven hundred years later) who approximates to the designation of the Constantine of Russia, because of his *role* of arbiter, and

his imperial prestige. It was Peter who abolished the patriarchate, and assumed the headship of both Church and State.

All the succeeding Czars up to Nicholas—the last of the Czars—retained and maintained that status. Inevitably the church had become an acquiescent agency of the Czardom,—subservient, sycophantic, superstitious. Rasputin, in the final phase, was a sinister but appropriate symbol of that unholy alliance against the well-being of the Russian people. The sacred confessional itself had become a camouflage for political espionage,—“the priest was the policeman of the Czar.”

It is against this historical background that we must seek to understand the psychology—and even the pathology—of the Bolshevik attitude to religion. “We must combat religion,” said Lenin. “The fight must be directed,” he continues, “toward eradicating the social roots of religion,” and adds: “The roots of religion today are to be found in the social oppression of the masses, in their apparently complete helplessness in face of the blind forces of capitalism.”

In order to effectuate their programme, the Bolsheviks, ironically enough, have made the State into a God. There is no God, and Lenin is his prophet! Perhaps the really tragic thing in the Sovietism of today is the fact that alike the freedom of the individual in the political sense, and the sanctity of personality in the spiritual sense, have gone by the board.

The Marxist protagonist, however, is ready with his rebuttal. The doctrines of Marx and the interpretations of Lenin, we are told, "consist of the theory of the ultimate evolution of Society into Anarchy,"—"the establishment of a society where there would be no classes, and consequently, the State being merely the expression of domination of class over class, no State."

The present State, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, the regime of force, are, it appears, merely, "a scientific possible way of attaining the goal,"—"an inescapable transitory stage during which the intellectual level of the masses is to be raised and the State, while protecting its people from hostile forces both within and without, is gradually educating them to be fit members of a society where 'the real thing is the attitude of mind, the relationship between human beings'."

Whether this ambitious theory of a planned "Anarchy," of a State working consciously toward the goal of a no-State which will be a millennial camaraderie, will work our or not time alone can demonstrate. Meanwhile, we have the interesting and challenging spectacle, at any rate, of an unprecedented attempt to fuse economics and ethics, theoretical idealism and practical despotism, into a working programme for large-scale social betterment.

IV

Lastly we come to Gandhi, the third great contemporary apostle of a new world order. If Wilson

was the protagonist for the western world of Europe and America, and Lenin for the one hundred and sixty millions of Russia, Gandhi may well be designated the Messiah of the teeming millions of the Orient. S. K. Ratcliffe, a distinguished English observer, as we have noted, says that Gandhi is "the most extraordinary popular leader ever known. His followers are counted by tens of millions."

Strange as it may seem, Gandhi's principles involve a rejection in fundamental respects both of the modern Western civilization and of the Bolshevik Utopia. Both of these, for instance, rest ultimately upon force. Gandhi has no use for force in any shape or form in human affairs, regarding it is a survival from our barbarous evolutionary past.

Here, in his own words, is his doctrine of non-violence:—

I have found that life persists in the midst of destruction. Therefore, there must be a higher law than that of destruction. Only under that law would well-ordered society be intelligible and life worth living.

If that is the law of life we must work it out in daily existence. Wherever there are wars, wherever you are confronted with an opponent, conquer him with love. I have found that the law of love has answered in my own life as the law of destruction has never done.

In India, we have had an ocular demonstration of the operation of this law on the widest scale possible. I don't claim that non-violence necessarily has penetrated the 360,000,000 people in India, but I do claim it has penetrated deeper than any other doctrine in an incredibly short time.

It takes a fairly strenuous course of training to attain a mental state of non-violence. It is a disciplined life, like the life of a soldier. The perfect state is reached only

when the mind, body and speech are in proper coordination. Every problem would lend itself to solution if we determined to make the law of truth and non-violence the law of life.

For those who may suppose that this is an academic doctrine propounded by a sentimental idealist, it should suffice to point out that Gandhi has been one of the most influential and powerful *men of action* of our time. The story of his public life of nearly forty years is a record of unyielding and unfaltering fight against social evils and political wrongs. A quarter of a century ago, in South Africa, he gave battle to no less redoubtable a warrior than General Smuts—and eventually won. More recently, a British Governor in India bewailed that Gandhi had brought the British Empire within an inch of losing India, and another distinguished functionary has said the British Government would sooner face a regiment than face Gandhi!

At any rate, Gandhi, too, symbolises something new under the sun. Every political revolution we have so far had in the world, every great movement for the liberation of man from entrenched monopolists of privilege and profit, has had to be fought out in terms of violence and hate and inevitable bloodshed. Gandhi, however, as the acknowledged leader of the greatest revolutionary movement of all history has deliberately and definitely eschewed the traditional technique of revolution. He would conquer by love instead of hate, by self-suffering

instead of violence. He asks his followers therefore to be killed, if necessary, but never to kill. Never, in human history, has Jesus' principle of non-resistance to evil been applied on anything like this colossal scale. It is a tremendous example of the fierce might of the truly meek. "Soul-force" is greater than sword force—if only it can be invoked and applied in complete integrity. Gandhi says:

Just as a scientist will work wonders out of various applications of the laws of nature, a man who applies the laws of love with scientific precision can work greater wonders.

For non-violence is infinitely more wonderful and subtle than forces of nature, like, for instance, electricity. The man who gave us the law of love was a far greater scientist than any of our modern scientists.

That Gandhi is living up to his own professions and prescriptions can be attested by a hundred items of evidence, besides those we have already presented.

Some other basic divergences between Gandhi on the one hand and Bolshevism and Capitalism on the other, may be touched upon.

Both Western civilization and Soviet Russia magnify the State at the expense of the individual. Gandhi would give the primacy to the individual—to the individual's initiative and integrity—in his scheme of things. The "totalitarian state," denying mind and coercing conscience, would be inadmissible in this philosophy.

Both Western civilization and Soviet Russia be-

lieve in the efficacy of regulation and coercion to achieve their social ends. Gandhi would work deliberately by moral suasion and force of *personal example among leaders* to achieve his. Unlike both Western civilization and Soviet Russia he would seek *first* the kingdom of righteousness as an all-absorbing individual consecration, and have all the rest added unto that.

The idea that we can make people moral, virtuous, temperate and generally righteous and humane, merely by passing laws and putting them on the statute book is one that would appear fantastic and even pathetic to Gandhi. External authority can never be a substitute for inner sanction.

Gandhi has no use for the organized militarism and profiteering commercialism of Western civilization. He believes that this system puts a premium on greed and the baser propensities of human nature. He believes that ethical conduct among human beings can be better promoted by fostering spiritual convictions and integrity than by State regulation and control.

On the other hand, Gandhi has no use for the seeming Godlessness of the Bolsheviks and their divorce of morals from religion. *God for Gandhi is the fount and source of all human inspiration*, and he would build up the entire fabric of the social and economic order upon faith in and communion with God on the part of the individual.

Forcible coercion is for Gandhi a sign of weakness and not of strength, and he believes that results

achieved by compulsion are bound to be ineffective and unenduring. On the other hand, when men and women become imbued with a sense of decency and honor, when — by voluntary and deliberate choice—they become less selfish and more righteous, they would automatically tend to cooperate for their mutual good and, in the fullness of time achieve the millenium.

Another Utopia! you say. True enough. Take your choice of the three Utopias held before your gaze!

Reprinted from
THE NEW HISTORIAN, New York, November, 1931

APPENDIX A

The Significance of Mahatma Gandhi's Loin Cloth

By SYUD HOSSAIN

SOME eight years ago I was speaking on Gandhi and India at a well-known New York club.

Gandhi's personality had not yet emerged from the fog of political controversy, and he was the object of a great deal of adverse propaganda from interested quarters. My task had been to explain and expound the movement of "Non-violent non-cooperation" which Mahatma Gandhi had just recently launched in India, with necessary references to his personality and principles. My American audience had been manifestly interested, and at the close of my talk made a generously sympathetic response.

There was a forum period after the lecture. A well-known and distinguished gentleman who felt that it was his duty to hold a brief not only for British imperialism, but for the so-called Nordic civilization at large, was much perturbed. He

apparently felt that he must counteract the favorable reaction to the "rebel" Gandhi that had seemingly been evoked. He took the floor and made a long speech which ended with this peroration:—

After all, Ladies and Gentlemen, we of the Western World cannot follow the leadership of a man who goes about half-clothed.

As the principal speaker, I was asked by the chairman to reply. I said:—

The most important thing about Mahatma Gandhi is not what he wears; the most important thing about Mahatma Gandhi is not even his body; the most important thing about Mahatma Gandhi is his soul. And as for the alleged inability of the Western peoples to accept the leadership of someone not conventionally clad, I am reminded that the one whom they call their Master was also clad in nothing more than a loin cloth at a crucial moment in the history of humanity.

There was a tense silence, and the meeting dissolved.

Two points seem worth considering. First, the significance of Gandhi's exiguous garment; and, secondly, the significance of the exaggerated attention that the exiguity of his garment apparently receives in many quarters of the so-called Western World.

Why does Gandhi wear a loin cloth? Is it in affectation? Or is Gandhi an exhibitionist? His whole life and work and all his antecedents furnish the answer to those questions. So far from Gandhi's scanty attire being a trick of the sensation-monger,

or a lapse into eccentricity, it is perhaps the most courageous and cleansing gesture of modern times.

A man who could have lived in the lap of luxury, and draped himself in purple and ermine, has deliberately chosen to identify himself with the poor, the humble, and dispossessed and the disinherited of the earth. When Gandhi long ago chose as his life-work the service and championship of the down-trodden and the exploited, he began progressively to identify himself with them. He was a wealthy man when he gave away his own fortune for philanthropic purposes. He took the vow of non-possession: he would own nothing for the sake of possession.

At a very important stage in his campaign for the material and moral rehabilitation of the Indian masses, and the restoration of their historic indigenous industries, he deliberately chose to have no more than a loin cloth for himself, when he found that there were millions, the victims of a cruel exploitation, who could afford no better. As Gandhi put it, it was "an organic evolution in my life."

Some months ago the English correspondent of a London paper visiting India saw the "half-naked" Mahatma Gandhi at a garden party in Delhi, and wrote back home that there was a compelling majesty in the unaffected simplicity of the man that could only be described as regal. Since then Mahatma Gandhi has taken his seat, attired as usual, next to the Lord Chancellor of England at

the Round Table Conference in St. James's Palace in London, and participated in its proceedings, with the same regal composure.

A word or two now as to the psychology of the naked human body. Why are so many people afraid of it? In the Western World the pendulum seems to swing between the flaunting excesses of Nudism and, for men at any rate, the cramping artificiality of a convention which has made the attire more important than the body which it clothes. How many men are among us who can *afford* to go about like Gandhi? Only a transparently clean body, in the spiritual sense, can afford to have the light of day beat upon it without flinching—neither abashed nor self-conscious.

There is a further moral that may be pointed. Gandhi is giving battle, not only to the oppressions and violences of the Modern World, but also to its shams and the gratuitous complications in which it has all but strangled the essential simplicity of human life, and the natural dignities of human living.

Reprinted from
PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS

APPENDIX B

India: Great Britain's Dilemma*

By SYUD HOSSAIN

Iam sure you all realize that the topic that has been assigned to me is of such dimensions that it would not be possible for me to do more than touch upon some of its salient aspects in the time at our disposal. But nevertheless, it is precisely the kind of question that we have to try to know something about in a World Affairs Institute if we are to have a proportioned understanding of the problem that is engrossing all of us, not only here, but men and women in every part of the world, namely, the problem of the future of civilization. My specific theme is that of India. Frankly, I do not believe that India is much more than a geographical expression to the majority of the American people. When you hear the name "India," what precisely is the image that is brought to mind? What does India mean to any of you? I imagine that if that question were answered by the indi-

*An address delivered at the twelfth session of the Institute of World Affairs held at Riverside, California, December 9 to 14, 1934.

viduals making up an average group, we would have some unexpected and surprising results. Nevertheless, from the world-peace point of view it is extremely important for us to understand this particular question.

I may recall at the outset—as I am addressing primarily an American audience—at least one historical bond that unites America with India. You remember that when Columbus set out on his famous voyage of discovery, he had set out to discover not the United States of America but India. Of course it would be appalling to think now what would have happened if you had not been discovered! As some pessimist asked, who would have been there to lend money to Europe? However, leaving that alarming speculation alone, I do suggest that, inasmuch as Americans do owe their national discovery, as it were, and subsequent organization into nationhood, to the fact that it was the name and fame of India that had captured the imagination of Columbus, the least that they can now do is to try to discover India for themselves, and it will be a discovery, if I may say so, no less exciting or romantic than that of Columbus if you should acquire an insight into the spiritual and aesthetic heritage of that ancient land.

I do not look upon my own role tonight as anything much more important than that of a guide along part of the way of your intellectual voyage of discovery of India.

I wonder how many of you consciously realize

that Columbus, to his dying day, did not know that he had not discovered India? That might, to the Americans of today, be a fact perhaps of small account until one begins thinking about it. As a matter of fact, the historical and geographical blunder of Columbus has left a definite, permanent impress not merely on your habits of thought, but even on the daily usage of your language. You talk about the aboriginal people of this continent as the "Red Indians." Why? Because Columbus landing on these shores fondly imagined that he had discovered India, and he promptly proceeded to dub the people he found here "Indians." Those people were not Indians of any sort or kind, but even today that original blunder is perpetuated in the common parlance of the American people. Not merely that, but, as a resultant error, you refer in your daily usage to the people of India as Hindus, which is equally inaccurate and misleading. You use the term "Hindu" as interchangeable with the term "Indian," whereas the two terms, in important respects, have not an identical connotation. The term "Hindu" denotes a religious grouping, like the term "Christian." If you ask someone what he is, and he says, "I am a Christian," he may be an English Christian, or an American Christian, or a Polish Christian, or an Indian Christian. The term "Hindu" likewise denotes the followers of Hinduism, which happens to be the oldest living religion of the world, antedating even Judaism. The scriptures of India comprise the

oldest written religious documents of the human race. It happens that all Hindus are Indians, but not all Indians are Hindus. There are, besides the Hindus, millions of Moslems, Buddhists, Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians in India. It will help toward clearness of thought and accuracy of expression if we keep that fact in mind. This, however, is only a digression.

I want to get back to India and to the question I asked you at the outset: What is the image that is brought to your mind when you hear the name India? What is India? I believe I am correct in saying that for the majority of Americans it denotes a remote country, not merely remote in point of physical distance, but also in respect to its customs and institutions. India, in the popular imagination, is the embodiment of the mythical "Mysterious East." It is the particular function of a World Affairs Institute, I take it, to dispel unnecessary international mysteries, however attractive or intriguing they may be. I shall therefore try to focus your attention upon some of the factual and historical aspects of India, and its world importance.

In physical size, India, although it is always referred to as a country, is in fact a subcontinent. India has exactly the same physical size as Europe minus Russia. It would not occur to many of you in this room to generalize about Europe as perhaps the vast majority of you do generalize about India. Supposing someone were to say, "I am a European." Precisely what would that mean? The person

might be an Englishman, a Pole, a Spaniard, a Turk, or a German. He might be a Scandinavian or a Bulgarian. In precisely the same way, the facile habit of generalizing about India and Indians is extremely detrimental from the point of view which I want to emphasize—the need for accuracy of statement in international and interracial matters.

India has a population of over 350,000,000 people, the second largest numerical unit on the face of the earth, the first and largest being that of China, which has a population of 400,000,000. Now these 350,000,000 people represent approximately one-fifth of the human race; and I want to submit to you that the well-being and destiny of one-fifth of the human race cannot and should not be a matter of indifference to the rest of the human race. We cannot really discuss vital world problems in any serious or comprehensive manner without taking thought of India—of its present and its future. India has a direct bearing on the achieving of peace and stability in the world. Important as India is from the point of view of its size and population, she has an infinitely greater significance that transcends the physical and numerical aspects of the country to which I have referred, and that is the place of India in the cultural history of mankind. I wonder again, to how many of you has it occurred to realize consciously the part India has played in the creation of the world's civilization. It was Professor Max Muller of Oxford who said that

India was the cradle of human civilization. There is abundant historical testimony to substantiate that statement. To follow that idea through, would involve a rather exhaustive excursion into the complex domain of the cultural origins, and the comparative contributions, of the half-a-dozen races and nations that may be described as the pioneers of human civilization. It will suffice now for me to give you one or two citations on the point that may, I trust, be found stimulating. You are all no doubt familiar with the name of Lord Curzon, the distinguished statesman, who was Foreign Minister of England a few years ago, and who previously had been British Viceroy in India, and earlier in his career had won fame as a classical scholar at Balliol. Here is a statement made by Lord Curzon:

Powerful empires existed and flourished here (in India) while Englishmen were still wandering painted in the woods, and while the British Colonies were a wilderness and a jungle. India has left a deeper mark upon the history, the philosophy, and the religion of mankind than any other terrestrial unit in the universe.

We may supplement this statement by what the Abbe Dubois, famous French authority, has put on record. He says:

India is the world's cradle; thence it is that that common mother, in sending forth her children even to the utmost West, has bequeathed to us the legacy of her language, her laws, her morals, her literature, and her religion. Manu inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation, and his spirit permeates the whole economy of our European laws.

These, of course, are statements of historical

fact, in respect to which there is general agreement among authentic scholars. The primacy of India is unique. Before Greece and Rome were heard of in history, India had given to the world the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*, still ranked among the noblest and most profound spiritual and philosophical formulations of mankind.

So much for the historical background of India. What of the India of today? India today, as you all know, is a part of the British Empire. In international law and status that is her position. But India was not always a part of the British Empire; as a matter of fact, India functioned as a highly civilized entity for several thousands of years before there was such a thing as the British Empire, or even the British nation. The British connection with India, in any shape or form, does not exceed more than a little over three hundred years. The very first attempt the British made to enter into relations with India was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Later, a mission was sent to India asking for favor of facilities of trade with India. The Emperor of India granted the request. India made the British welcome. For more than a century of their three hundred odd years' connection with India the British carried on as legitimate traders. Then, when the great Mogul Empire began to crumble, and a period of civil strife and national disorganization followed, the British felt they might fish profitably in troubled waters. They took a hand in the game together with the French and

the different Indian princes who were engaged in a struggle for supremacy.

Later they took a more active part in the struggle as actual belligerents successively for or against different princes. This phase of the matter, which makes a rather sordid and cynical story, lasted the better part of a hundred years. At the end of the long-drawn-out conflict, when the Indians were exhausted and their resources depleted, the British emerged with a margin of superior strength, not only in the military sense, but from the point of view of the strategic advantages of their position in the country, diplomatically and politically, as against any individual rival for power among the Indian protagonists. The fact that they were able to draw upon England for fresh supplies in manpower and materials was a decisive factor in the ultimate results. By a series of alliances with Indian princes, and otherwise, they gradually consolidated their position and finally acquired virtual political and economic control of that vast Empire. This condition, however, dates back to 1818 and the actual vesting of the sovereignty of India in the British Crown dates only from 1858. Queen Victoria was proclaimed the first British ruler of India, as Empress, in 1877.

It is extremely important, I think, that we should see the British connection with India in correct perspective. Three hundred years of association and a hundred odd years of political domination constitute a rather small episode in the annals of a coun-

try and race whose civilization, according to Sir John Marshall, the official archaeologist of the British government, dates back to 3000 B.C. and has continuously functioned as a living organism through the ages. The British Empire in India is a result of that great movement of European expansion which followed upon the discovery of the sea route, and which, after the Industrial Revolution consolidated into colonialism and imperialism. Not only Great Britain, but France and even Belgium and Holland have colonial empires of no inconsiderable size to this day. The age of colonial empires, however, is nearly done. Their primary motive was greed, and their method coercion and exploitation. The instincts and convictions of decent human beings throughout the civilized world today—and not least in England herself—are definitely against the perpetuation of that system. It is irreconcilable with the new conceptions of international morality and the imperative needs of the new world order. There can be no real progress toward the attainment of world peace until principles of equity and fair dealing are not merely professed but practiced among the nations. Whatever might have been the case in the past, we must resolutely try in the future to remove causes of friction and conflict, of bitterness and hatred among the nations. A moral disarmament must necessarily precede a military or a naval disarmament,—and the latter will not materialize until the former has been first affirmed

in the hearts of men and embodied in the policies of statesmen.

The problem of India and England is not one that calls for emotionalism or sentimental partisanship on one side or the other. It calls for sympathetic understanding plus uncompromising adherence to principle. The question that we have to ask ourselves is this: Does the kind of relationship that exists between Great Britain and India make for world peace and that larger civilization for which we are all hungering today? The essential issue is not racial, or national, or even political. It is an issue in principle. It is an issue between an antiquated system and the needs of a new day. India today, as I have said, is a part of the British Empire. But in fact there is not one British Empire; there are two British Empires. There is a British Empire that is British in race, language, and traditions, and that is united by bonds of sentiment as well as common economic or political interests. In this category come Canada, Australia, and New Zealand whose basis of allegiance to the Crown and Empire is free consent and willing co-operation. There is another British Empire, however, which is not British in race, language, or traditions and whose economic interests are not identical with those of Great Britain or those of the other units of the real British Empire, and by far the largest and most important entity in this category is India. The basis of allegiance here is less the willing consent of the people of India than the

armed forces, military and naval, of the British Imperial Government.

The two fundamental facts about British rule in India from the moral point of view, are: first, that it was originally imposed on the people by force and is today maintained by force; and in the second place, that during its entire course, both under the East India Company and under the Crown, the primary motive of governance has been the economic and commercial gain of Great Britain rather than the prosperity and well-being of the people of the country. As a matter of fact, the two sets of interest, of necessity, must in large measure be mutually exclusive.

For instance, Great Britain has used India as a huge reservoir for raw materials and as a market for her own manufactured goods. This policy involved the extinction of the indigenous industries of the country and consequent impoverishment to the point of destitution of millions who were engaged for untold generations in those industries.

In Great Britain, as in every other country, there are decent, liberal, forward-looking men and women responsive to the world idealism of today, who frankly recognize these facts, and are willing and even anxious that India shall have justice, while there are also the die-hards and the reactionaries clinging with the energy of despair to the profits and paraphernalia of an outmoded order rapidly receding into the past.

The kind of problem we have been considering

tion" with the British regime as the method of securing its objective. So far no appreciable concessions to the Indian demands have been made by the British government, although a bill is under consideration for presentation to the British Parliament.¹

Gandhi does not believe in force, and therefore has exhorted his people to fight for their rights by "love and self-sacrifice." The revolutionary technique of Gandhi consists in undeviating non-cooperation with practices and methods that he considers immoral or unethical, and the willing acceptance of penalties and suffering imposed for such defiance without retaliation.

Every movement for political liberation that history knows of has been fought out in terms of hate and violence and bloodshed. Gandhi is trying to work out a departure from that precedent, and, if he should succeed, it would be an epoch-making event. Many people in England, including some of the foremost figures, are in sympathy with the ideals and objectives of Gandhi, and a great many more are sincerely anxious that an amicable and honorable solution of the deadlock shall be found. The Labor party, for instance, the second largest political party in Great Britain, is officially committed to the principle of self-determination for India.

On the other hand, there are the Conservatives

¹The bill was duly introduced into Parliament and enacted into law. The new Indian Constitution went into effect on April 1, 1937.

with a Bourbon mentality, and the powerful vested interests—military, civil, and commercial—which are the chief beneficiaries of Britain's connection with India. These forces of reaction, commanding enormous political and financial influence, have so far blocked and frustrated any real approach to a lasting settlement.

Nevertheless, a settlement by consent, it seems to me, is necessary if the risk of bloodshed and violence and the certainty of bitterness and hatred between the two nations are to be avoided. Moreover, it is not too much to say that implicit in the ultimate relationship between India and England is the future trend of relations between the Orient and the Occident—whether they shall be at perpetual loggerheads or friends and copartners in behalf of a new and common world civilization.

I suggest that it is the duty of men of good will irrespective of nationality, in all such international disputes and deadlocks, to try to foster the elements of amity and accord, not by vain methods of pusillanimity but by unflinching adherence to principle. As Lincoln said, nothing was ever settled that was not settled right. And we want a settlement of the Indian problem that shall be right. In the accomplishment of this vast and vital task, not the least helpful factor should be active co-operation of those men and women of British race who value their immortal traditions of love of liberty above their heritage of Empire.

India must become a free and self-respecting

member and partner in the comity of nations, and the continued denial of her inalienable right to such status, under specious and ignoble pleas, is a grave wrong to India, a violation of England's integrity, and an affront to the intelligence and idealism of civilized mankind.

Reprinted from
PEARSON'S MAGAZINE, New York, July, 1922

APPENDIX C

SYUD HOSSAIN

FRIEND OF GANDHI AND SPOKESMAN FOR INDIA

By BLANCHE WATSON

K IPLING has said that "The East is East and the West is West, And never the twain shall meet . . . " but in Syud Hossain, friend and co-worker of Mahatma Gandhi of India, we have a man—now in our midst—who embodies a denial of this widely accepted dictum, and one who most effectively symbolizes the intellectual concord and spiritual community of mankind. This man who, judged by physical characteristics, might have come from one of the Latin countries of Europe, but who in dress and speech is the typical English intellectual, may properly be classed as a citizen of the world, to whom the East and the West are indeed one.

From the moment almost of his landing Syud Hossain has been an animated denial. He has been obliged to *deny*, not once but scores of times, that

the Mohammedans and Hindus are deadly enemies; that the former are all Turks; that India is the size of Texas; that the Mohammedan is a ferocious war-maker; that India is unfit to govern itself; that England is in India for the "welfare" of Indians; that Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent resistance movement is a preparation for bloodshed and violence. These and many other items of misinformation this able and cultured Indian has good-humoredly corrected, leaving some of us with a smaller stock of information in regard to his country—but a more reliable one. Syud Hossain, however, has a positive and constructive message for us in the West—a message which embodies among other things the unique story of the Non-cooperation, better known as the Gandhi movement, that is sweeping like a tidal wave from one end of India to the other.

He is peculiarly well fitted for his task. He has been identified with the Mahatma's movement from its very inception, and played his part through the difficult period of the nation's preparation, and the equally difficult period of national discipline that followed the decision of the All India Congress in 1921, to enter upon their fight for Swa-Raj against the British Raj. No more whole-hearted endorsement of the gospel of Gandhi is to be found than are comprised in his writings.

As a spokesman for the Mohammedans Mr. Hossain played a prominent part in the achievement of Hindu-Muslim unity—an achievement that

has added more, perhaps to the fame of Mahatma Gandhi than anything else that he has done—for this unity has proved to be one of the greatest assets in this struggle of 350,000,000 people for freedom against alien and oppressive rule.

In 1920 the peril which assailed the integrity of the Sultan of Turkey, as Caliph of the Moham-medan world, produced an immense sensation in India. Syud Hossain was one of the three specially elected delegates sent to Europe to represent the Indian case in regard to the Near East settlement, to the allied statesmen responsible for framing the Turkish Peace treaty. He and his colleagues had interviews with Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Millerand, and other British, French and Italian statesmen. His mission, over, Syud Hossain was called upon to accept the editorship of *India*, the organ of the India National Congress in London. This paper—as was the case with *The Independent*, which he edited in his own country, became a notable exponent of the national viewpoint and the national policy. Fearlessness and passion for the truth, a keen intelligence, together with an unshakable intellectual poise, are the characteristics of his journalistic work no less than of his other public activity.

While in Europe he lectured before distinguished audiences, enlightening and educating Europeans on the politics of India and the Near East, and bringing before them forcefully and clearly the great historic debt which Europe owes to his coun-

try, particularly to Islamic culture and Islamic democracy.

From London, Syud Hossain came here by invitation to lecture at the Town Hall, and later to attend the Washington Conference as Press Representative for India. Anxious to serve the cause of India, he has been speaking, in the intervals of his attendance at these sessions, wherever and whenever he had been bidden.

With a rare charm of manner, with language richly eloquent but simple and direct, this man presents in an entirely new light the problems and the fears, the successes and the hopes of the new India. It is not alone the earnestness and eloquence and magnetism of the man that holds people, nor yet the content of the message that he has to give, —inspiring though it is. There is a plus; and that plus, I cannot but feel, is the result of his personal contact with this unique spiritual movement together with a more than ordinary insight into the "great soul" that is leading it. Gandhi, symbolizing India with all its hopes and aspirations, fills the speaker's heart and mind so completely that the words that come from his lips seem to have a more than ordinary appeal, and his listeners become absorbed in the almost unbelievable thing that is going forward with such miraculous strength on the far side of the world.

An aristocrat, as his name signifies and his face indicates, he exemplifies the best traditions of his religion, and of his family and national inheritance.

If it is true that out of the heart the mouth speaketh, this descendant of the Prophet Mohammed is worthy of the friendship of "the greatest man in the world," as Gandhi is called. He, too, seems to have learned the power of Love in human relationships, the true inwardness of the Sermon on the Mount—which has been Gandhi's own guiding principle—while he personifies in himself the democratic tradition of Islam, which tolerates not the slightest manifestation of inequality—no sign of violation of the Brotherhood of Man.

This Mohammedan has brought home to our hearts what his Hindu countryman Rabindranath Tagore stressed in all of his public utterances in this country, namely, that the East and the West are truly one. His, too, is the thought of the great Persian who has just passed out:

"Let a man not glory in this, that he loves his country: let him glory in this, that he loves his kind."

And as an Indian he tells us that his country is demanding that she be allowed to make today (as in the past) her own peculiar contribution to the culture, to the social, philosophic, political, and religious thought of the modern world. He says that to do this she must be free! She must work out her own destiny untrammelled and uncoerced. He has pictured for us India's intellectual and spiritual leader striking at British Imperialism with infinite love and toleration towards the enemy. He points out that the Fighting Man of Peace wants

freedom for his country, not for the benefit of Indian people alone, but for the peace and well-being of all mankind. He shows him fighting for that freedom by Christ's method instead of by Ceasar's, with the "sword" that never rusts and cannot be taken away! When Syud Hossain speaks, the thought is borne in on us that the message that was the Nazarene's two thousand years ago is Gandhi's message today: and we feel that his is a voice of prophecy when he says: "Upon this hangs the redemption of the world."

